IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

WESTERN REFINING SOUTHWEST, INC., and WESTERN REFINING PIPELINE, LLC,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

Civ. No. 14-804 KG/KK

3.7820 ACRES OF LAND IN MCKINLEY COUNT, NEW MEXICO, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER STAYING CASE

On January 16, 2015, the Court held a case management hearing with United States Magistrate Judge Kirtan Khalsa in attendance. Plaintiffs were represented by John Cooney, Charles Armgadt, Hunter Marckwald, and Thomas Sansonetti. Nineteen *pro se* Defendants attended the hearing. Howard Thomas and Stephanie Kiger represented Defendant United States, and Cassie Fleming represented Defendant Sefina Garcia. Having heard the argument and comments by counsel for Plaintiffs, counsel for Defendant United States, counsel for Defendant Sefina Garcia, and Defendant Patrick Adakai, *pro se*,

IT IS ORDERED that

- 1. this case is stayed, except for completion of briefing on the Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Complaint for Condemnation (Doc. 58) and the Motion for Order that No Response is Required to the "Request or Remove Pipe" in Doc. 36 or in the Alternative for Extension of Time (Doc. 123), pending the Court's ruling on the following motions Plaintiffs will be filing:
- (a) Plaintiffs' motion for surreply to United States of America's Reply to Plaintiffs' Response [Doc. 121] to United States' Answer (Doc. 139); and

- (b) Plaintiffs' motion requesting that Defendant United States provide legal representation to the *pro se* Defendants;
- 2. D.N.M. LR-Cv 7.1(a) ("Movant must determine whether a motion is opposed, and a motion that omits recitation of a good-faith request for concurrence may be summarily denied.") is suspended with respect to the above motion for surreply and for the motion requesting that Defendant United States provide legal representation to the *pro se* Defendants; and
- 3. Plaintiffs will file the motion requesting that Defendant United States provide legal representation to the *pro se* Defendants by February 2, 2015; Defendant United States will file a response by February 18, 2015, unless the Court grants an extension of time; and Plaintiffs may file a reply within the time frame specified in D.N.M. LR-Cv 7.4(a).

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE